



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,756	04/14/2005	Martin Raubuch	SC12303EM	2224
23125	7590	04/12/2007	EXAMINER	
FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.			PARTRIDGE, WILLIAM B	
LAW DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
7700 WEST PARMER LANE MD:TX32/PL02			2183	
AUSTIN, TX 78729			MAIL DATE	
			04/12/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/531,756	Applicant(s) RAUBUCH, MARTIN
	Examiner William B. Partridge	Art Unit 2183
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
THE REPLY FILED 19 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 14-21</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.</p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		

ADVISORY ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed the 19th of March 2007 (03/19/2007) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In remarks, the applicant argues in substance:
(1) Scales, III et al. does not teach a controller that is coupled between the plurality of control registers and the permutation logic block as recited in claims 1, 2, and 5.

Examiner believes that Scales, III et al. does in fact teach the above limitation. Scales teaches a register file (FIG. 2, Vector register file 200) containing vectors and a combine network (FIG. 2, Combine network 210) to perform Permute-With-Replication operations. The vectors contained in the register file can be used as input vectors, control vectors, or output vectors as is specified by the instruction (e.g. "vperm VT, VA, VB, VC wherein VA and VB are input vectors, VC is a control vector, and VT is an output vector). As the vectors used in each operation are specified by the instruction (Column 5, lines 35-38) then there must be a controller between the register file and combine network in order to actually select the specified registers. Without there being some type of controller to actually select which of the 32 registers in the register file are to be used for the inputs and control vectors it would be impossible for the combine network to receive only the vectors of interest in the operation.

Therefore, Scales, III et al. implicitly teaches a controller coupled between the control registers and permutation logic block.

(2) Scales, III et al. does not disclose the selection of one of the control registers by a controller as recited in claim 1.

Examiner believes that Scales, III, et al. does in fact teach the above limitation. The controller would have to select one of the 32 potential registers in the register file to output as the input into the combine network as the control vector to use.

Therefore, Scales, III et al. implicitly teaches the controller selects the control register to be used.

(3) Scales, III et al. does not disclose that the controller provides the control parameters from the selected one of the plurality of control registers to the permutation block as recited in claim 1.

Examiner believes that Scales, III, et al. does in fact teach the above limitation. The output from the controller would be an input to the combine network's control input line.

Therefore, Scales, III et al. implicitly teaches the controller provides the control parameters to the permutation block.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William B. Partridge whose telephone number is (571) 270-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR 7:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner: William B. Partridge
Date: 3rd of April 2007 (04/03/2007)


EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100